

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RICKY KALEO ONAALII MANUEL,

Case No.: 2:21-cv-01803-APG-BNW

Plaintiff

Order

v.

CLARK COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

Defendant

Plaintiff Ricky Kaleo Onaalii Manuel brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at the Clark County Detention Center. ECF No. 1-1. On October 5, 2021, the magistrate judge ordered Manuel to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee by November 30, 2021. ECF No. 3. The magistrate judge warned Manuel that the action could be dismissed if he failed to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$402 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. *Id.* at 3. That deadline expired and Manuel did not file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, pay the full \$402 filing fee, comply with the order or otherwise respond.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply

1 with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S.*
2 *Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court
3 order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, I must consider:
4 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its
5 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
6 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *See In re*
7 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*
8 *v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)).

9 The first two factors (the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and
10 my interest in managing its docket) weigh in favor of dismissal of Manuel's claims. The third
11 factor (risk of prejudice to defendants) also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption
12 of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the
13 court or prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The
14 fourth factor (the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits) is greatly
15 outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

16 The fifth factor requires me to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to
17 correct the party's failure that brought about the court's need to consider dismissal. *See Yourish*
18 *v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic
19 alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord*
20 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that "the persuasive
21 force of" earlier Ninth Circuit cases that "implicitly accepted pursuit of last drastic alternatives
22 prior to disobedience of the court's order as satisfying this element[.]" *i.e.*, like the "initial
23 granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[.]" have

1 been “eroded” by *Yourish*). Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before
2 finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v.*
3 *Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed
4 until and unless Manuel either files a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or
5 pays the \$402 filing fee for a civil action, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting
6 another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays the
7 inevitable and squanders the court’s finite resources. The circumstances here do not indicate that
8 this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Manuel needs additional time or evidence that
9 he did not receive the court’s order. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative
10 given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

11 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of
12 dismissal. I therefore order that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Manuel’s
13 failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402
14 filing fee in compliance with the magistrate judge’s October 5, 2021, order. The Clerk of Court
15 is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed
16 in this now-closed case. If Manuel wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a
17 new case.

18 Dated: December 8, 2021

19 
20 _____
21 ANDREW P. GORDON
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23